

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

COPY MAILED

FEB 2 8 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of Rabindranath Dutta

Application No. 09/726,269

Filed: November 30, 2000

Attorney Docket No.: AUS920000774US1

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed January 9, 2006 to withdraw the holding of abandonment, under 37 CFR 1.181, in accordance with the reasoning of the decision in <u>Delgar Inc. v. Schuyler</u>, 172 USPQ 513.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.181 is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR
1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.181," or, as explained in more detail below, "...under 37 CFR 1.137(a)" or (b). This is not a final agency decision.

Petitioner argues that the Final Office Action mailed June 2, 2005 was not received by the inventor and provides a statement from an individual responsible for handling incoming mail and docketing, as well as a copy of a Case History Report from petitioner's Case Tracking System as proof.

A review of the record indicates however that the Final Office Action was mailed to the correspondence address of record at the time of mailing but that a revocation and power of attorney was filed December 21, 2005, subsequent to the mailing of the Office Action.

As the revocation and power of attorney is dated after the mailing of the Office Action, petitioner's have not shown that the address of record at the time of mailing was not the proper address of record or, that the USPTO mailed the Office Action to the wrong address.

In view thereof, the Office Action was mailed June 2, 2005, to the proper address and this application was properly held abandoned on September 6, 2005, for failure to file a timely reply to the Final Office Action. Accordingly, the Notice of Abandonment mailed December 15, 2005 was appropriate and will not be withdrawn.

ALTERNATIVE VENUES

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)¹ or 37 CFR 1.137(b),² which now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The filing of a petition under the unintentional standard cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore should be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

¹A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) <u>must</u> be accompanied by:

⁽¹⁾ the required reply, unless previously filed; In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

⁽²⁾ the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(I);

⁽³⁾ a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

²Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) <u>must</u> be accompanied by:

⁽¹⁾ the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

⁽²⁾ the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

⁽³⁾ a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may required additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

⁽⁴⁾ any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

By mail:

Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:

(571) 273-8300

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

Patricia Faison, Ball

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions